



## **Town of Arlington, MA Redevelopment Board**

### **Agenda & Meeting Notice November 20, 2023**

Per Board Rules and Regulations, public comments will be accepted during the public comment periods designated on the agenda. Written comments may be provided by email to [cricker@town.arlington.ma.us](mailto:cricker@town.arlington.ma.us) by Monday, November 20, 2023, at 3:00 p.m. The Board requests that correspondence that includes visual information should be provided by Friday, November 17, 2023, at 12:00 p.m.

The Arlington Redevelopment Board will meet Monday, November 20, 2023 at 7:30 PM in the **Arlington Community Center, Main Hall, 27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476**

#### **1. Review Meeting Minutes**

7:30 pm      The Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes for November 6, 2023.

#### **2. Meeting Schedule**

7:35 pm      The Board will decide on a date for their 2023 Board Retreat.

#### **3. Zoning Amendments Preliminary Discussion**

7:45 pm      The Board will discuss zoning amendments to bring to 2024 Annual Town Meeting.

#### **4. Open Forum**

8:45 pm      Except in unusual circumstances, any matter presented for consideration of the Board shall neither be acted upon, nor a decision made the night of the presentation. There is a three-minute time limit to present a concern or request.

#### **5. New Business**

9:00 pm

#### **6. Adjourn**

9:15 pm      (Estimated)



## Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

---

### Review Meeting Minutes

#### Summary:

7:30 pm            The Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes for November 6, 2023.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Reference Material	11062023_DRAFT_AMENDED_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	11062023 DRAFT AMENDED Minutes Redevelopment Board.pdf

**Arlington Redevelopment Board**  
**Monday, November 6, 2023, at 7:30 PM**  
**Select Board Chambers, Town Hall**  
**730 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington, MA 02476**  
**Meeting Minutes**

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

**PRESENT:** Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau (remote), Stephen Revilak

**STAFF:** Claire Ricker, Director, Planning and Community Development

---

The Chair called the meeting of the Board to order.

The Chair opened with **Agenda Item 1 – Review Meeting Minutes.**

October 2, 2023 – The Board had no comments on the minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the October 2 minutes. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

October 10, 2023 – The Board had no comments on the minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the October 10 minutes. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

October 16, 2023 – Mr. Benson made two minor corrections. The Chair requested a motion to approve the October 16 minutes as amended. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

October 23, 2023 – The Chair made one minor change. The Chair requested a motion to approve the October 23 minutes as amended. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 2 – Continued Public Hearing: Docket #3752, Calyx Peak, 251 Summer Street.**

Ms. Ricker said that she has spoken with the representative of Calyx Peak several times over the last month about getting updated site plans. After careful consideration, they have asked that the Board close the hearing for Docket 3752, opened on June 5, 2023. They may submit a new Special Permit Application with updated plans at some point in the future.

Mr. Lau asked if the applicant plans to resubmit for a different site. Ms. Ricker said that they are still trying to work out a plan at 251 Summer Street but have not yet been able to come to terms with the property owner.

Mr. Benson said that he was not clear about whether the applicant is withdrawing their application or asking the Board to vote no on their application. Ms. Ricker replied that are withdrawing their application and asking the Board to close the hearing without a finding. The Chair said that the Board would then need a motion to accept their withdrawal and vote to close the hearing on Docket 3752. If the applicant chooses to resubmit, they would need to start over again and submit a new Special Permit Application.

Mr. Revilak said that he has no objection to entertaining a motion to withdraw. The Chair agreed and said that this application has had significant issues, and the applicant has yet to present their application to the Board. The Board should give them the time to work out their issues with the site and the landlord and then come back when they have an actual project to propose.

The Chair asked for a motion to accept the withdrawal of the application for Docket 3752 and close the docket without finding, with the stipulation that should the applicant wish to pursue this project in the future, they would need to return to the Board with a new Special Permit Application. Mr. Revilak so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 3 – Reopened Public Hearing: Docket #3602, 1207-1211 Massachusetts Avenue.**

Ms. Ricker said that this docket is a request for an extension of the three-year Special Permit which was granted in August 2020. The appeal of the permit was dismissed by the Court in December 2020. The applicant has not indicated what time frame he would like the extension to be. The applicant has submitted no updated plans, and the original decision still stands, based on the original plans submitted.

James Doherty, the owner of 1207-1211 Massachusetts Avenue and applicant for Docket #3602, presented his request. The hospitality industry was hit hard by COVID-19, which delayed his plans to build a hotel on the site. Recently, the industry has begun to recover. The proposal is a viable project and would be an asset to the community. He requests a two-year extension of the permit granted in 2020.

The Chair noted that the hospitality industry has been vibrant for the last two years, and she is disappointed that there has not been progress on this project. She asked how far away the applicant is from submitting drawings to the Building Department. Mr. Doherty replied that he has nothing right now and will not until something concrete is nailed down. The Chair asked what is not concrete given that he has an approved site plan. Mr. Doherty said that he would need to acquire an operator to operate the hotel.

Mr. Benson noted that the permit included plans for a restaurant, and he asked if Mr. Doherty has a company lined up to operate the restaurant. Mr. Doherty replied that they would not identify a restaurant tenant until the hotel operator is selected. Mr. Benson asked what steps the applicant went through between the granting of the Special Permit and now to move the project forward. Mr. Doherty replied that he, like many property owners, was uncertain about the economy. He was taking care of current commercial tenants in his other properties and trying to make sure that their businesses survived. He did continue discussion with people who had been interested in the project, but they were not prepared to move forward. He said that hardly any new construction in the hospitality industry that wasn't already financed or contractually committed to happened in 2021 or 2022. He noted that at the time of the initial hearing, negative comments and accusations were made, including comments attributed to the Redevelopment Board on local television about the economics and status of the project. No one from the Board or Department of Planning and Community Development spoke to him before making such statements.

The Chair asked if Mr. Doherty is in full possession of the property. Mr. Doherty replied that he is.

Mr. Benson noted that when the Board approved the Special Permit in 2020, Mr. Doherty was anticipating that the project would be a boutique hotel. He asked if that is still Mr. Doherty's goal. He replied that it is. He said that he could have built residential development on that property a long time ago, but he wants to build this commercial development because he thinks it is what is best for Arlington. A number of years ago, the Board and DPCD began focusing on mixed-use development to increase commercial tax revenue. This project is the only one that has resulted from those plans. He wants this project to succeed both for himself and for the town. If the Board elects not to extend the permit, he will move on.

Mr. Benson noted that Mr. Doherty sounds very defensive, and he is not sure why, given that the Board has not made any decision and is here to listen and understand. Mr. Doherty said that he is defensive because he's been trying to get dialogue going on this matter since last fall and has not received a response, and now it is very close to the time of the expiration of the Special Permit. He is coming to the Board approaching this project as an economic development package for the town.

Mr. Benson said that in the time since the Special Permit was issued, some changes in zoning have taken place that would affect the project were the permit issued now, including requirements for roof-top solar and the extended stretch code. He asked the other Board members if there is a way to extend the permit while imposing such conditions. The Chair replied that the Board can discuss what conditions it wishes to impose as part of an extension of the permit.

Mr. Revilak asked if Mr. Doherty is proposing any change to the plans that were approved in 2020. Mr. Doherty replied that he is not.

Mr. Lau said that he is still supportive of this project, which he thinks will be an asset to the town. He supports a two-year extension, with the stipulation that Mr. Doherty must return to the Board in one year with an update on the progress made during that year, and that if he fails to do so, the extension would then end.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment on Docket 3602. She asked speakers to raise their hands and, when called on, to come to the chair in the front with the microphone and introduce themselves with first and last names and their Arlington street address. Each speaker will have up to three minutes to address the Board.

- Susan Stamps, 39 Grafton Street, Town Meeting Member and member of Tree Committee – She has three points she would like the Board to consider:
  - The 2020 Special Permit section 7A approves the planting of flowering pear trees. The Tree Warden no longer plants flowering pear trees because they have been shown to be brittle and invasive. She requests that the applicant be required to consult with the Tree Warden and plant a species recommended by him, or to use the Tree Committee's list of recommended urban trees, found at [www.arlingtontrees.org](http://www.arlingtontrees.org).
  - The zoning bylaws have changed since this permit was approved. Section 6.3 requires developers to plant a street tree every 25 feet along the development. She requests that the applicant be required to comply with Section 6.3.1.
  - Since the permit was issued, Town Meeting has passed the Specialized Stretch Code, which includes stronger requirements for energy-efficient building. She requests that the applicant be required to comply with the new code.
- Ann LeRoyer, 12 Pierce Street – She is a neighbor of this site, and she has had concerns about the project from the beginning. The fact that it may be delayed even longer means that the site, which is quite unattractive, will remain unimproved. One of the arguments for approving the project initially was to have the property be cleaned up, but that hasn't happened. She is concerned about how much longer it will stay in its current state.

The Chair is concerned about the fact that no progress has been made thus far and the site has not been maintained. Given that, she thinks a two-year extension is too long. She does not have a lot of confidence that the project will move forward, even with the extension.

Mr. Benson still supports the concept of the project. It is difficult for him to judge whether it could have moved forward during the past three years. He agrees that a two-year extension is too long. He would consider supporting a shorter extension, with the condition that the project meet all current zoning requirements.

Mr. Revilak said that the Stretch Code is a building permit requirement, so the Redevelopment Board does not have to require it; the applicant's plans will have to meet the Stretch Code in order to get a building permit. Mr. Revilak agreed with Mr. Lau's suggestion. He is okay with the two-year extension but wants to see evidence of progress after a year. He would like the applicant to be required to meet the current conditions in the zoning bylaw.

The Chair asked if the bylaw changes include anything other than street tree planting and roof-top solar. Mr. Benson said he was not sure, but he thinks the extension should include the condition that the project meet all conditions of the current zoning bylaw, not the bylaw as it was in place when the original permit was granted. The Chair said that she thinks the Board needs to be more specific, so as to be clear with the applicant about what is required of them. She proposed continuing this hearing and working with Ms. Ricker to make sure they have a complete list of all the zoning changes in the intervening three years, so as to issue an extension with a clear set of conditions. Mr. Revilak said that he thinks an extension explicitly requiring only the tree planting plan and the solar bylaw would be sufficient.

Mr. Lau said that he is still comfortable with a two-year extension, but only with the condition that the applicant be able to show evidence of concrete progress within a year. At that point, he wants names of hotel operators they are in discussion with, a contract with an architect to start the working drawings, and progress indicating that they expect to be able to apply for a building permit by the end of the two years. He thinks that one year is fair to show that kind of progress.

The Chair said that she thinks one year is too long to wait for an update. She would like an update in six months, given that the project has gone this long with no movement. She said that the Board owes it to the community to keep a

tighter eye on this project and ensure that it moves forward. The Chair said that if there continues to be no progress, at some point the Board will have to decide if the project needs to be formally re-permitted. Mr. Lau said that he would be okay with requiring updates at six months and at one year.

Mr. Benson said that he would like to hear from Mr. Doherty about whether he could meet the requirement to have a six-month check-in if the Board grants a two-year extension. Mr. Doherty said that he was fine with a six-month check-in. He does not intend to continue this process indefinitely. In six months or a year, if he determines that it is not viable to build a hotel, he will propose building something else. The site was an automotive use before he bought it, and it could be that again, but he wants to build something better for the town. He also noted that it is unfair to expect him to comply with changes to the bylaw that will increase his costs while not acknowledging that the Floor Area Ratio of the site has gone from 1.5 to 3.0. The Chair said that Mr. Doherty can ask the Board to re-open the permit or start a new permit, rather than extending the current permit, in order to take advantage of the increase of the Floor Area Ratio.

The Chair noted that the Town sold the site with the promise that this project would be developed. She thinks that the Board's most important responsibility is to figure out the best way to work together with the applicant to ensure that, as the Select Board conveyed the property, the property is used for the best outcome for the town. Nobody wants to see the property continue to lie vacant for another three years. The check-ins are the only vehicle that the Board has to make sure that it moves forward. Mr. Doherty said that he is not opposed to the check-ins, but he wants to make sure that throughout the process, he and the Town can work together positively, which he does not feel has always been the case.

Mr. Revilak understands Mr. Doherty's point that the bylaw has changed in multiple ways, and if he were to reapply today, there would be a much higher FAR limit. At this point, he is inclined to issue a clean extension, with no change to conditions or plans, with six-month check-ins. If Mr. Doherty were to resubmit with a different set of plans that comply with the current bylaw, the Board could consider allowing him to build to a higher FAR.

Mr. Benson said he is okay with a two-year extension with check-ins at six months and one year. He is not okay with a clean extension; he wants to require compliance with the tree-planting and solar bylaws, neither of which is very expensive. He would also like to clarify that if there are significant changes to the project, such as a change from a boutique hotel to a chain hotel, that is not acceptable under the current permit. The Chair agreed with Mr. Benson's suggestions.

Mr. Lau agreed with Mr. Revilak. He would like to issue a clean extension with check-in requirements, including compliance with the newer bylaws as an option but not a requirement. He does not want to revisit the decision that was made in 2020.

The Chair said that she would not vote to extend the permit without requiring compliance with the street tree and solar bylaws. Mr. Benson agreed. Mr. Revilak said that he would prefer a clean extension, but he would not vote no if the extension included conditions. The Chair asked Mr. Lau if he would support an extension with conditions. He said that the tree issue is relatively minor, but he is concerned about the solar requirement. The project was not designed to have solar panels, so requiring it would change the architecture of what was already approved. The design included roof-top units with an enclosed farm. That would leave very little room for solar panels. Mr. Benson noted that the solar bylaw has exemptions if solar panels are not appropriate for a particular project, so Mr. Doherty would have the opportunity to argue before the Board that the project meets one of the exemptions. Mr. Lau said that if they expect the applicant to claim an exemption, then there's no point in the Board requiring compliance with the solar bylaw. The Chair said that requiring compliance puts the onus on the developer, as it is in many other parts of the zoning bylaw, to make sure that they have made the effort towards compliance. Mr. Benson also noted that the building is not fully designed yet, so he doesn't think that requiring compliance is a burden. Mr. Lau said that he would go along with the compromise in order to see the project go forward.

The Chair asked for a motion to approve a two-year extension, to December 8, 2025, with regular six-month check-ins with the Board over that two-year period, the first being on May 6, 2024, with future dates set thereafter, with the additional conditions that the applicant comply with zoning bylaw Sections 6.3.1, Street Trees, and 6.4, Solar Energy Systems, and that the tree plantings included in the project be in compliance with the current list of species as approved by the Town. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 4 – 2024 Meeting Schedule.**

The Chair noted that the proposed schedule includes April 15, but that is Patriot's Day and part of school vacation week. She proposed replacing it with April 8. She also proposed changing the July 8 meeting to July 15, and tentatively adding August 5 to the schedule. The Board can always choose to cancel meetings if they are unnecessary, but having no meetings in August has proven to be problematic in the past. The other Board members agreed to the changes.

Mr. Lau requested that the Board schedule a retreat for the Board to consider the direction and priorities of their work in 2024. The Chair agreed and proposed finding a date in early December or early January, at which they can discuss which of their ideas for zoning amendments to pursue for Annual Town Meeting in April. Mr. Revilak proposed Sunday, December 3, 2023, as the date for the Board's retreat. The other Board members agreed. The Chair said that the Board would finalize the date and time at the November 20 meeting.

The Chair would like to put a discussion of the meeting schedule leading up to Annual Town Meeting on the November 20 agenda.

Mr. Benson proposed changing the June 3 meeting to June 10. The other Board members agreed.

Mr. Lau asked if the Board's retreat could include updates on past projects the Board has approved. Ms. Ricker said that she would do her best to provide that information. She should be able to provide updates on projects approved in the last year or so, but she's not sure how far she can go back.

The Chair said that she would work with Ms. Ricker to create an agenda for the Board's retreat and circulate among the other Board members it for review.

The Chair asked for a motion to approve the Board meeting schedule as amended. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Revilak seconded, and the Board voted unanimously.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – Open Forum.**

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. Seeing no one who wished to speak, the Board closed Open Forum.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 6 – New Business.**

Ms. Ricker said that she and Town Manager Jim Feeney met with the candidate for the open seat on the Board, and she will be confirmed by the Select Board on Wednesday, November 8, 2023, and sworn in at the Board's meeting on November 20, 2023.

Mr. Benson said that the Board needs to create an application for Site Plan Review for the MBTA Communities Overlay District. Ms. Ricker said that she and DPCD staff could create a draft. It may not be ready for the November 20 meeting, but will be ready by the Board's retreat or December 4 meeting. The Chair noted that the Board's Rules and Regulations will need to be updated to include Site Plan Review.

Mr. Benson asked for an update at a future meeting about the request to EOHLIC to use Arlington's inclusionary zoning requirement for the MBTA Communities Overlay District. Ms. Ricker said that she spoke with the state and the Town's consultant, MAPC, about the Economic Feasibility Analysis, which is progressing.

Ms. Ricker also noted that the final MBTA Communities Overlay District language will be formally submitted to both EOHLIC and the Attorney General's office in a parallel process.

Mr. Revilak said that the Massachusetts Citizen Planner Training Collaborative puts together a set of classes addressing the kinds of issues that come up in the context of planning and zoning boards. He believes that this fall will include a module on Site Plan Review, which he plans to attend.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Revilak so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted and approved unanimously.

Meeting **Adjourned** at 8:45 pm.

7 of 13



## Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

---

### Zoning Amendments Preliminary Discussion

#### Summary:

7:45 pm      The Board will discuss zoning amendments to bring to 2024 Annual Town Meeting.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

	Type	File Name	Description
▢	Reference Material	2022-09-24_Zoning_and_Policy_Recommendations.pdf	2022-09-24 Zoning and Policy Recommendations



# ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS IN RECENT PLANS

MP = Master Plan, RC = Recodification, HPP = Housing Plan (2022), CA = Connect Arlington (2021), AHNAP = Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan (2018),  
FHAP = Fair Housing Action Plan (2021), NZAP = Net Zero Action Plan (2021)

Plan	Strategy / Action	Category	Prerequisites and resources needed	Timeframe	Explanation
<a href="#">MP</a>	<a href="#">RC</a> Reduce the overall number of zoning districts to address infill development and ease of use of the bylaw: address setbacks, dimensional standards, building height maximums, FAR, and minimum lot are per dwelling		Planning process Zoning amendment Political leadership Public education		Zoning Audit pg 9 (10 of PDF) Recodification pg 3
<a href="#">MP</a>	Reduce the number of uses requiring special permits which makes the bylaw overly restrictive, confusing, and impractical for the purposes of determining build out and growth		Study / planning process Zoning amendment Political leadership Public education		Zoning Audit pg 3 and 12-14 (4, 13-15 of PDF)
<a href="#">MP</a>	Address parking issues throughout bylaw, including parking in front setbacks, maximums instead of minimums, greater reductions for residential and some commercial		Planning process / review of Connect Arlington Zoning amendment Staff capacity		Zoning Audit pg 3, 17-18 (4 and 18-19 of PDF)
<a href="#">MP</a>	Amend EDR, including conducting a study of special permits granted, incorporating staff review of smaller projects, and creating an easier to use table to determine appropriate criteria		Study / planning process Staff capacity Zoning amendment		Zoning Audit pg 3 and 17 (4 and 18 of PDF)
<a href="#">MP</a>	Amend standards for townhouses		Zoning amendment		Zoning Audit pg 15 (16 of PDF)
<a href="#">RC</a>	Add regulations for short term rentals		Zoning amendment		Recodification pg 7
<a href="#">MP</a>	Add transfer of development rights		Planning process Zoning amendment		Zoning Audit pg 19 (20 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	1 Allow two-family homes in the R0 and R1 zoning districts as of right	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Staff capacity Political leadership Political education	Near term	Pg 79 (86 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	2 Adopt zoning to comply with G.L. c. 40A Section 3 (MBTA Communities)	Shortage of affordable housing	Planning process Staff capacity Political leadership Zoning amendment	Near term	Pg 75 (82 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	3 Update regulations of R2, R3, and R4 to allow three family dwellings and townhomes as of right	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Staff capacity Political leadership Public education	Near term	Pg 79 (86 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	4 Consider options for strengthening Arlington's inclusionary zoning bylaw	Shortage of affordable housing	Market analysis and feasibility study Zoning amendment	Near term	Pg 76 (83 of PDF)

# ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS IN RECENT PLANS

MP = Master Plan, RC = Recodification, HPP = Housing Plan (2022), CA = Connect Arlington (2021), AHNAP = Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan (2018), FHAP = Fair Housing Action Plan (2021), NZAP = Net Zero Action Plan (2021)

Plan	Strategy / Action	Category	Prerequisites and resources needed	Timeframe	Explanation
<a href="#">HPP</a>	5 Conduct a racial impact study to determine whether Arlington's existing residential zoning has a disproportionate impact on BIPOC and other groups protected under the Federal Fair Housing Act	Impediments to housing choice	Racial impact assessment tool Political leadership	Near term	Pg 79 (86 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	9 Continue to require open space for multi-family and mixed-use buildings, but allow flexibility in where and how it is achieved	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment	Near term	Pg 81 (88 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	14 Actively implement the Connect Arlington plan by focusing on active transportation options for new development and amending current parking requirements and parking design standards for residential projects	Impediments to housing choice	Revised off-street parking requirements Revised on-street parking policy Complete Streets planning and implementation ADA Plan implementation	Ongoing	Pg 82 (89 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	19 Explore options to establish a Ch. 40R "Smart Growth" overlay district in Arlington	Shortage of affordable housing	Planning process Staff capacity Design guidelines Zoning amendment	Medium term	Pg 75 (82 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	20 Consolidate existing districts to create viable sites and zoning more land for multifamily uses	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Planning process	Medium term	Pg 75 (82 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	21 Improve development opportunities along major corridors and incorporate density bonuses for increased affordability	Shortage of affordable housing	Zoning amendment Market analysis and feasibility study	Medium term	Pg 75 (82 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	22 Allow redevelopment of preexisting nonconforming residential uses in the Industrial Zoning District, and make residential uses easier to permit through redevelopment and reuse of Industrial District sites	Shortage of affordable housing	Permit tracking under existing Industrial District rules Consultation with developers	Medium term	Pg 76 (83 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	23 Consider options for discouraging single-story buildings in the Town's business and mixed-use districts	Impediments to housing choice	Market analysis and feasibility study Zoning amendment	Medium term	Pg 76 (83 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	26 Require the installation or improvement of sidewalks, bike paths, or pedestrian trails to access the nearest park or open space in locations where on-site provision of open space is not feasible	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Technical assistance to ZBA (for comprehensive permits)	Medium term	Pg 81 (88 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	28 Consider an Affordable Housing Overlay (AHO) modeled after Cambridge's AHO	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Zoning Map amendment Staff capacity Public education	Medium term	Pg 80 (87 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	32 Increase the amount of land zoned for multifamily development, reorganize existing multifamily districts	Shortage of affordable housing	GIS mapping Plan for district consolidation/assembly Zoning map amendment	Medium term	Pg 75 (82 of PDF)

# ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS IN RECENT PLANS

MP = Master Plan, RC = Recodification, HPP = Housing Plan (2022), CA = Connect Arlington (2021), AHNAP = Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan (2018),  
FHAP = Fair Housing Action Plan (2021), NZAP = Net Zero Action Plan (2021)

Plan		Strategy / Action	Category	Prerequisites and resources needed	Timeframe	Explanation
<a href="#">HPP</a>	37	Provide for "Missing Middle" zoning along minor collector streets in walkable residential neighborhoods	Impediments to housing choice	Zoning amendment Zoning Map amendment Staff capacity Public education	Medium term	Pg 80 (87 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	38	Evaluate the feasibility of / plan for mixed-use development with affordable housing on the municipal parking lot in Arlington Center	Impediments to housing choice	Planning process Developer procurement and land disposition	Longer term	Pg 76 (83 of PDF)
<a href="#">HPP</a>	41	Integrate Arlington's housing policies with the Net Zero Action Plan	Impediments to housing choice	Multiple zoning amendments Pedestrian / bicycle accommodation	Longer term	Pg 82 (89 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	F.1.1	Continue to refine and promote TDM requirements and strategies that reduce car trips	Reduced climate impacts from travel in Arlington	Review Cambridge TDM programs Zoning amendment	Near term	Pg. 1-43 (66 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	F.1.2	Continue to incentivize mixed-use, higher-density development near transit and jobs	Reduced climate impacts from travel in Arlington		Near term	Pg. 1-43 (66 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	F.1.2.1	Establish Chapter 40R Smart Growth Overlay District	Reduced climate impacts from travel in Arlington	Zoning amendment	Medium term	Pg. 1-43 (66 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	F.1.2.2	Consider zoning amendments and incentives to reduce the need to drive	Reduced climate impacts from travel in Arlington	Zoning amendment	Medium term	Pg. 1-44 (67 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	G.3.1	Identify locations for dedicated curbside zones for pick-up and drop-off activity	Infrastructure and policies to support local economy and resident quality of life	ARB-adjacent	Near term	Pg. 1-48 (71 of PDF)
<a href="#">CA</a>	G.3.3	Repurpose on-street parking where possible to prioritize other modes including bus and bicycle travel, or to provide additional open space in commercial areas	Infrastructure and policies to support local economy and resident quality of life	ARB-adjacent	Near term	Pg. 1-49 (72 of PDF)
<a href="#">AHNAP</a>		Create new "AHB District"	Zoning regulations	Zoning amendment Map change	Near term	Pg 2 and 30 (5 and 33 of PDF)

# ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS IN RECENT PLANS

MP = Master Plan, RC = Recodification, HPP = Housing Plan (2022), CA = Connect Arlington (2021), AHNAP = Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan (2018),  
FHAP = Fair Housing Action Plan (2021), NZAP = Net Zero Action Plan (2021)

Plan		Strategy / Action	Category	Prerequisites and resources needed	Timeframe	Explanation
<a href="#">AHNAP</a>		Rezone Gold's Gym site as PUD-AH	Zoning regulations	Zoning amendment Map change	Near term	Pg 2 and 37 (5 and 40 in PDF)
<a href="#">AHNAP</a>		Create tiered review processes: 1) site plan review, and 2) Administrative Environmental Design Review (allowing staff review of smaller projects)	Review process	Zoning amendment or ARB Rules and Regulations amendment	ND	Pg 2 and 29 (5 and 32 in PDF)
<a href="#">AHNAP</a>		Review existing Design Standards to ensure they reflect neighborhood specifics	Review process	Create commercial design guidelines (funded for FY23)	Near term	Pg 2 and 37 (5 and 40 in PDF)
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C1	Reduce the overall complexity of the Zoning Bylaw through recodification	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C2	Allow two-family development by right in nominally single-family districts where two-family dwellings were historically commonplace.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C3	Allow three-family, townhouse, and multifamily housing options by right in districts nominally meant for them.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C4	In districts intended for higher densities, only allow single-family developments by Special Permit, if at all.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C5	Amend restrictive dimensional and parking requirements for multifamily uses that make development infeasible in districts where those uses are appropriate.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C6	Explore zoning amendments that would allow the conversion of large existing single-family homes to two- and three-family homes.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C7	Explore zoning amendments that would allow two- and three-family homes in single-family districts where the total building size is similar to that of abutting single-family homes.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C8	Ensure zoning conforms with the new state-level requirements for MBTA communities.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C10	Raise the threshold for EDR review, particularly on major corridors, replacing that review with performance standards for new developments.	Review process	Zoning amendment Revision to ARB rules and regulations	ND	Pg 59-61
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C11	Limit subjective criteria in discretionary reviews, eliminate review standards that perpetuate segregation, and define clear performance and design standards that projects will be reviewed against.	Review process	Zoning amendment Revisions to rules and regulations of various boards and commissions (ARB, ZBA, ConCom, AHC, AHDC)	ND	Pg 59-61
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C12	Consider distinct density and dimensional regulations for development that is 100% affordable housing.	Zoning Bylaw	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 55-58

# ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS IN RECENT PLANS

MP = Master Plan, RC = Recodification, HPP = Housing Plan (2022), CA = Connect Arlington (2021), AHNAP = Arlington Heights Neighborhood Action Plan (2018), FHAP = Fair Housing Action Plan (2021), NZAP = Net Zero Action Plan (2021)

Plan	Strategy / Action		Category	Prerequisites and resources needed	Timeframe	Explanation
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	C13	Consider approvals by right for developments that are 100% affordable housing.	Review process	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 59-61
<a href="#">FHAP</a>	D1	Provide opportunities for housing developments that would trigger the Town's inclusionary zoning requirements.	Inclusionary Zoning	Zoning amendment	ND	Pg 58-59
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 3	Change zoning or other bylaws that hinder the renovation or construction of net zero energy capable buildings. Create incentives to encourage renovation and new construction projects to result in net zero energy capable buildings.	Net zero buildings	Zoning amendment Equity considerations: be careful not to create affordability impacts, and consider how to include affordable housing (pg 31)	Medium term	Pg 15 (19 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 9	Prohibit fossil fuel heating systems in new construction and major renovations.	Net zero buildings	MBTA Communities zoning must be adopted to participate in state pilot program Equity considerations: Ensure that policy is developed with input from housing advocates and developers to avoid unintended consequences such as restrictive development of affordable housing (pg 33).	Near term	Pg 17 (21 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 10	Allow amendments to height, setback, and density requirements by Special Permit for energy efficiency and renewable energy installations at existing buildings.	Net zero buildings	Zoning amendment	Medium term	Pg 18 (22 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 11	Require all new commercial buildings and multi-family buildings above a certain number of units to include solar PV and/or solar thermal (or be "solar ready") on a minimum of 50 percent of roof area.	Net zero buildings	Zoning amendment	Done	Pg 18 (22 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 15	Consider establishing a Chapter 40R Smart Growth Zoning Overlay District to allow for dense residential or mixed-use development.	Net zero buildings	Zoning amendment; Equity considerations: Design overlay district to promote Equitable Transit Oriented Development (eTOD).	Medium term	Pg 19 (23 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	NZB 16	Support training opportunities for Town departments, boards and committees, as well as developers and contractors, on LEED, Net Zero, Passive House and other high-performance energy standards.	Net zero buildings	Funding for training	Ongoing	Pg 20 (24 of PDF)
<a href="#">NZAP</a>	ZEM 6	Require changes to parking policies that would maximize efficient use of spaces, reduce use of single occupancy vehicles, and give dedicated parking to zero emission vehicles.	Zero emission mobility	Equity considerations: When considering residential parking requirements, remember that the more resources dedicated to building out unnecessary parking will, in turn, mean fewer resources likely available for other amenities. This can be particularly problematic when it comes to affordable housing where scarce financial resources are going toward parking rather than the build out of much needed housing units (pg 38)	Medium term	Pg 24 (28 of PDF)